

REMARKS

Amendments to Claims

In order to clarify the claimed invention, Applicants are amending independent Claims 21, 76, 91 and 92 to include the features of a gate electrode formed over a first substrate; a source wiring formed over said first substrate; a first insulating film formed on said gate electrode and said source wiring; a semiconductor layer formed over said first insulating film; a second insulating film; a gate wiring formed on said second insulating film, and electrically connected to said gate electrode; and a connection wiring for electrically connecting said source wiring and said semiconductor layer, and formed on said second insulating film. These features are shown for example, in Embodiment 7 and in particular page 34, line 10 – page 36, line 15 in the specification and Fig. 15 of the present application. Hence, no new matter is being added.

Applicants are also amending Claims 22-24, 75-77, 85-87, 90, 91 and 93-96 to correct informalities therein.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that these amendments be entered and allowed.

Applicants will now address the Examiner's new rejections in the Office Action.

Double Patenting - Non-Statutory

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 21-24, 76, 77, 85-90, 93, 94, 97 and 98 on the grounds of non statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 or 9 and 2, 4, and 6 of U.S. 7,023,021 in view of Yokomizu, Nagayama, Kanemoto and Yoneya. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, it is believed that all of the above-features of independent Claims 21 and 76 are not claimed in US 7,023,021. It is also believed that these features are not disclosed in the other cited references.

Accordingly, there is no double patenting, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects Claims 91, 92, 95, 96, 99 and 100 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokomizu (JP 10-073813) in view of Nagayama et al. (U.S. 5,680,187) and further in view of Kanemoto et al. (U.S. 5,493,429) and Yoneya et al. (U.S. 6,300,926). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

In particular, it is believed that all of the above-features of independent Claims 91 and 92 are not disclosed in the cited references.

Therefore, independent Claims 91 and 92 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 91 and 92 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant is submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 9, 2008

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568